

THE

US ISSN 0010-1443

COLONIAL NEWSLETTER

P. O. Box 4411

Huntsville, Alabama 35815

J. C. Spillman, Editor

Volume 33, No. 2

July, 1993

Serial No. 94

Two New Features

ASK the EDITORS

Pages 1372 - 1378

&

The Editorial Roundtable

Pages 1378 - 1382

plus

Gleanings

(G-8)

A Late Date Analysis

of the

Fairfield Hoard

by *Edward R. Barnsley* (1962)

Page 1383

TN-131 Revisited, or Mea Culpa

Most Common Confederation Coppers

Page 1385

TN-151 Revisited & Corrected

Page 1387

In Memoriam

Walter H. Breen

Dr. Warren A. Lapp

Sequential page 1371

Copyright ©1993 by The Colonial Newsletter Foundation, Inc.

ASK the EDITORS

There have been a number of suggestions made by our Associate Editors for improvements to CNL having the objective of creating a less formal format and thereby increasing the participation of our Patrons, especially the newcomers to our organization who may not have the depth of knowledge that many of our longtime Patrons have accumulated. We do have a tendency to forget just how difficult a subject the Early American coinages present to someone who is just beginning to develop an interest in this still mostly unexplored area of our nation's history! We are introducing with this issue a new feature **ASK the EDITORS** with the hope that this will open new avenues for our Patrons to explore the more informal aspects of our hobby.

The **ASK the EDITORS** concept was suggested by Associate Editor Gary Trudgen and was accompanied at almost the same time by a letter from CNL Patron Kevin Space of Minden, NE asking a number of general topic questions which, ordinarily, ye Editor would have attempted to answer privately by return mail. In accordance with Gary's idea ye Editor forwarded a copy of Kevin's letter to each of our new Associate Editors with a request for replies or comments which could be combined and published in this new feature.

Inquiries for this new feature should be addressed to:

The Colonial Newsletter
"Ask the Editors"
P.O.Box 4411
Huntsville, AL 35815-4411

In keeping with our long established policy of categorizing questions, answers and subjects with an identifying alphanumeric symbol for ease in indexing these new **ASK the EDITORS** inquiries and replies

will be identified, not surprisingly, as AE-1 and etc. and included in our Cumulative Index in that manner. In addition we may, from time to time identify our Associate Editor's contributions by their initials:

Mike Hodder = MJH
Phil Mossman = PLM
Gary Trudgen = GAT
and, ye Editor = JCS

Our newest Cumulative Index update, by the way, covering issues 1 through 93 was mailed just a few weeks ago; suggestions from our Patrons for improvements to the Index are **always** appreciated. Especially needed are corrections for errors of omission! The more comprehensive the cross-indexing becomes, the more useful the index will be for our Patrons.

Back to **ASK the EDITORS** - - here are the five questions from CNL Patron Kevin Space:

AE-1. Was there an inventory taken of the Stepney Hoard, if so, do you have a list of the varieties represented there and how they were disposed of.

AE-2. I would also like to know more about Mr. Ed Barnsley. Where did he obtain most of his Connecticuts? How many different varieties are represented in the Barnsley/CNL collection? How did these become the property of CNL?

AE-3. On CNL page 852, Mr. Barnsley states that Dr. Hall's entire collection of Connecticut coppers stayed together and ended up in the Connecticut State Library Museum with the exception of a few pieces. If so, how did Mr. Hessberg end up with so many ex-Dr. Hall specimens. I counted at least 130 ex-Dr. Hall pieces in his sale.

AE-4. I have also been doing some research on the theory that the 1787 T reverses were recut from r reverses. I have recently received a photo of the 33.36-T.3 from the Taylor sale from Dave Bowers

and in comparing the T.3 reverse to the example of r.3 in my collection, it does appear that this is a strong possibility. The die crack from NDE to the second cinquefoil appears the same on both dies. Also, on the T.3 die, the area around LI appears to have been ground down with the L and I then being repunched higher than in the r.3 die giving the B the appearance of being lower on the T.3 reverse than on the r.3 reverse. Have you tried the photo optical comparison technique you used on the obverses of 1786 on this theory or do you know of anyone who has proven that the T reverses were recut from r reverses?

AE-5. I also would like for someone to publish condition census information on Connecticut coppers. Is anyone working on this? It shouldn't be too hard to put together a census of the R-7 and R-8 varieties should it?

And here is another question that arrived about the same time as those from Kevin Space — this one from M. H. (Bill) Williams of Palm Harbor, Florida.

AE-6 I have been trying to learn more about how citizens (in early America) fared with money and other forms of exchange, and with banking. So far I have not located any references to "money changers." Question — Did merchants, for instance, oblige the locals by changing £ into shillings and/or pence?

So — here we go:

AE-1 The Stepney Hoard (also known as The Fairfield Hoard)

**Answer from CNL Associate Editor
Mike Hodder**

The Stepney Hoard. Walter Breen ably described this hoard in the January, 1952 issue of *The Numismatist* (page 20). Apparently, the hoard of about 200 copper coins,

found in 1950, was sold intact to Stack's in New York City. Stack's sold part of the hoard before Breen saw it, including a reported 8 uncirculated bust type Vermonts and 20 or so uncirculated Connecticut. Breen reported he saw 181 coins: 3 Vermonts (which he wasn't sure really came from the hoard), 1 Nova Eborac, 72 counterfeit British halfpennies (not Machin's Mills varieties), the rest Connecticut most of which were uncirculated. Breen's article describes some of the varieties he saw, but by no means all of them. He stated that he would publish a comprehensive listing of the hoard in the future but apparently never did. Some collectors have questioned whether there ever was a find of colonial era coppers near Stepney, CT. The described circumstances surrounding its recovery are very specific, however, and I feel it's somewhat unlikely that the hoard was "invented" to hide ownership and create a new pedigree. **MJH**

From ye Editor

The dual names for this hoard, the Stepney Hoard and the Fairfield Hoard result from the hoard being discovered in the town of Stepney located in Fairfield County, Connecticut. In September 1962 Edward R. Barnsley published "A Late Date Analysis of the Fairfield Hoard" in the Premier Issue of *NUMISMATIC DIGEST* (pages 7 and 8) edited and published in Nashville Tennessee by J. H. and C. S. Tate. This well intentioned but little known publication lasted for exactly two issues before it folded. The subscription obligation was assumed in November, 1962 by Chester Krause, Publisher of *COINS Magazine*. Copies of this publication as well as Barnsley's original manuscript are preserved in the Barnsley Papers in the CNL Technical Repository Collection. We are reprinting on page 1383 of this issue as a Gleanings topic Barnsley's little paper containing, among other things, a complete tabulation of the Connecticut die varieties contained in the Stepney Hoard. **JCS**

AE-2 The Colonial Newsletter "Barnsley" Collection of Connecticut Coppers.

Comments by ye Editor

Edward R. Barnsley became interested in the early American coppers sometime before 1966 when ye Editor first corresponded with him. Ned, as he was known to all of his friends, had collected just about every series of early coppers, especially New Jersey, Virginia, the Fugios and Machin's, as well as those of Connecticut. When I became acquainted with him he had already disposed of almost everything except the Connecticut Coppers. So far as I know he had traded all of these other series for various Connecticut specimens and sometimes complete collections such as the A.I. Donn (128 specimens) collection, the R.A. Vlack collection, the Gaylord collection, plus several large lots purchased from A. Kosoff (103 specimens) and others, and numerous individual purchases and trades with almost every known collector and dealer of the era!

Sometime early in the 1970s the Barnsley Connecticut Collection numbered between 2500 and 3000 specimens and was missing only a few die variety combinations: 2 for 1785, 9 for 1786; 35 for 1787, and 4 for 1788. Note that these are die variety combinations, actual missing die impressions were much fewer. For the year 1788 for example, only the S reverse was missing from the collection. Sometime later, in the mid-1970s, Ned decided to dispose of some of his collection by auction. The results of these sales were not very satisfactory, several were absolutely disastrous, and Ned decided to make donations of the remainder of his collection.

Today, the CNL/Edward R. Barnsley reference collection of Connecticut Coppers consists of approximately 2000 specimens the majority of which were donated by Ned

to The Colonial Newsletter Foundation, Inc. over a period of some 15 years. Some of the specimens in this reference collection are from other sources including purchases and donations by others, but the vast majority are from the original Barnsley collection. Within this reference collection there are several specialized sub-collections. One is a group of "dogs" all attributed by die variety but in such poor condition that they are of little monetary value; these are reserved for destructive scientific analysis. Another example are several groups of duplicates of specific die variety combinations for the purpose of exhibiting the repetitive edge markings of planchet cutting devices. Other smaller groups include brockage examples and groups of overstrikes.

The collection is recorded in a computerized database but it will be awhile before that database is complete. Ned did not weigh many of his coins or keep other metrological data other than a few notes on source, die orientation and undertypes; accordingly, it will be quite sometime before the complete metrology for each specimen will be entered in our database! **JCS**

AE-3 Ex-Dr. Hall Specimens in the Hessburg Collection.

Answer by CNL Associate Editor Mike Hodder

Dr. Thomas Hall's collection was large in size and probably included duplicate coins. Hall liked to mark his attribution numbers on his coins, using white lacquer applied with an artist's brush. Over time, the lacquer faded into a yellow color. Some of Hall's coins also seem to be marked on their obverses instead of their edges. Attribution numbers used were Hall's own, from his classification of the series done in 1892. Hall may have sold some of his coins while he was alive. He died in 1909 and his collection of 356 Connecticuts (along with hundreds of

Washington pieces and 159 New Jersey's) went intact to Virgil M. Brand on September 7 of that year. Brand seems to have sold parcels of Hall's Connecticuts while he was still alive. For example, Albert Fairchild Holden, who was Emery May Norweb's father, bought some from Hall's collection in 1913. On Brand's death Hall's Connecticuts were dispersed by B. G. Johnson during the 1930's, and that's how Hall's Connecticuts got onto the market. The Connecticut State Library Museum still has Hall's notebook as well as many Connecticut coppers from Hall's collection. Over the years other collectors also marked their coins with attribution numbers, either Hall's or, after 1920, Miller's. Whether or not it can be absolutely proven true, modern cataloguers usually describe any coins so marked as being "ex Hall Coll." However, if the number painted on the coin is from Miller's classification and there's no Hall number on the edge, the coin in question probably did not come from Hall's own collection. **MJH**

AE-4 Connecticut reverses T and r of 1787.

**Reply by CNL Associate Editor
Mike Hodder**

The late Ted Craige also felt that the T reverses were re-cut from the r reverses. He published this in CNL v.6, n.3 (March-June, 1966), seq. p. 164, when he announced his discovery of the T.3 reverse, writing " ...in fact, T.3 IS OBVIOUSLY A RECUT r.3 DIE!" He continued by saying "A little more study also reveals T.1 to be a recut r.2 and T.2 to be a recut r.3 die." When I catalogued Fred Taylor's Connecticuts I published under lot 2594 a memo from Richard Picker to Fred Taylor which mentions Ted's belief. The memo was dated April 13, 1966 and specifically mentions the break at NDE to cinquefoil as being identical on T.3 and r.3. Dick Picker hoped that Taylor would find the time to follow up on Craige's suggestion but I

guess he never did since I haven't seen anything published by Taylor on the subject. **MJH**

Comments by ye Editor

This is a question that can be accurately answered and demonstrated using the CNL developed FilmPrint techniques. That, however, requires a lot of time in the darkroom and is one of the projects that ye Editor wishes that he had the time to undertake. It is for just such reasons that ye Editor has requested assistance from our Associate Editors - - one objective being to make more time available to ye Editor for numismatic research projects! **JCS**

AE-5 Condition Census Data on Connecticut Coppers.

**Comments by CNL Associate Editor
Mike Hodder**

There are several people actively working on establishing CC data for Connecticuts, not just the R-7 and R-8's, but also most of the varieties. Somewhat reliable comments about the CC for different varieties can be found scattered through the sale catalogues of firms like Stack's (1991 to date), Rosa Americana (1989 to date), and Bowers and Merena (1987 to 1991). Older guesses at the CC for various combinations, like those found in Pine Tree's sales (1975 and 1976 EAC, Elizabeth Morton 1975 and John Carter Brown Library I 1976), represented Walter Breen's best estimates and in some cases remain accurate. The Taylor Collection sale of 1987 marked a return to attempting CC's for Connecticuts after a hiatus of some time. My own Connecticut CC is based only on coins I've actually seen (as opposed to coins graded on the basis of photographs or printed descriptions in catalogues), which now number over 4,000 specimens.

As rarity ratings decrease the CC's become more and more unreliable. In the introduction to the sale of George Perkins' duplicates (Stack's, March 1993) I wrote, in part: "...all statements regarding condition census here and elsewhere should be read as estimates and not incontrovertible facts. As time goes on and more specimens are added to our databases, estimates of CC status should become more and more reliable." The Connecticut minters struck hundreds of thousands of coins over several years. Until modern students of the series have satisfied themselves that they have seen the vast majority of those that survive, no one can be absolutely certain that a better coin might not suddenly surface, throwing the CC for that particular variety out the window! **MJH**

Comment from ye Editor

There appear to me to be some very serious gaps in our knowledge regarding Condition Census not the least of which seems to be the tendency of CC compilers to overlook many long established museum collections and to rely on catalog sale data instead. Not too long ago I happened to note a "Condition Census" advertisement for a Connecticut Copper specimen. The advertisement tabulated seven or eight "known" top specimens. A quick check of the CNL collection computer printout showed five nice examples of that particular die variety! This tends to make one agree with Mike Hodder's observations. **JCS**

AL-6 "Are there any references to 'money changers' - - Did merchants, for instance, oblige the locals by changing £ into shillings and/or pence?"

**Comment from CNL Associate Editor
Phil Mossman**

The question that Williams raises is one which has intrigued me since I've tried to uncover how the Confederation coppers were put into circulation. I assume that

there were always the village squires who could change money and the counting houses. So, how do I answer this? I asked John Kleeberg at the ANS who is a splendid researcher. He did his Ph.D. on banking in Germany and so has much banking history at his disposal. The only references he could suggest were those in Eric Newman's book and I have added two others of my own; however, I've written a few lines as follow:

The most direct answer is that I've seen nothing written on this specific point. One would assume on an "a priori" basis that there were merchants and counting houses with sufficient hard money on hand who could be persuaded to change large coins into smaller denominations.

However, if you are interested in early banking there are some pertinent references. A delightful book, W.T. Baxter, **THE HOUSE OF HANCOCK: BUSINESS IN BOSTON 1724-1775** (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1965), describes the day to day life within the firm owned by John Hancock's uncle, Thomas. The use of bookkeeping barter and commodity monies during this period of our history are recounted in some detail. There was a great tendency for those who owned specie to hang onto it. Commodity monies were in wide use in the beginning of the 18th century to be gradually displaced by paper currency. Except for small coins, I doubt that large denomination hard money circulated widely but was hoarded for major overseas remittances.

John J. McCusker and Russell R. Menard, **THE ECONOMY OF BRITISH AMERICA 1607-1789** (University of North Carolina Press, 1985 [now in paper back] (pp. 334-6) recount what little there is known about the genesis of private banking in America. They refer to John Hull, of Pine Tree shilling fame, who fancied himself "an exchange banker." The only other references of which I'm aware is Eric P. Newman, **THE EARLY PAPER MONEY OF AMERICA**. In this classic, Mr. Newman

discusses some of the early private banks which issued paper currency but makes no specific comment as to commercial banking functions.

What has intrigued me is to learn through what vehicle were state coppers introduced into circulation. Nothing has been recorded except for the disastrous plight of Royal Flint and the Fugios where he literally was left "holding the bag" of Fugios which lost their value during the Coppers Panic and he ended up in debtors' prison.

This is a long way to say *I don't know* to a simple question which is not so simple but rather the tip of the iceberg regarding the beginning of commercial banking about which few records exist. **PLM**

Additional Comment from ye Editor

The concept of "bookkeeping barter" between merchant and supplier and between merchant and individual occurs quite frequently in writings about early (17th and 18th century) banking concepts in America as well as those dealing with manufacturing. One gets the idea that banking in the modern sense was simply not required! The act of directly bartering a hog, say, for a bolt of cloth or some other necessity did not occur except infrequently; however, with "bookkeeping barter" a hog would be bartered to a merchant for a bookkeeping line of credit against which the owner of the hog could draw and thus purchase items from the merchant. During the 17th and 18th centuries throughout the world, unlike today, the political and economic power base was in the hands of the merchants and traders! Properly implemented, such a system did not require any currency. For the traveller, however, this would certainly have presented some problems, but even so, most travelling was by the merchants themselves and they no doubt had a ready solution for these special problems.

To illustrate these concepts are several quotations from various texts:

(1) Lewis, Lawrence. *A History of the Bank of North America, Philadelphia (1882) J.B.Lippincott & Co., pages 13-14.*

1763—1780

"The system of banking has taken its rise in this country within comparatively recent times. In early colonial days the Provincial Governments were carried on with too much economy and simplicity to require the aid of banking capital. Nor were the demands of the business world more pressing. Merchants could generally furnish each other with the loans and discounts necessary to carry on their affairs. A convenient circulating medium was afforded by bills of credit issued from loan-offices conducted by the government, and hypothecated upon real or personal security. To this accommodation merchants occasionally had resort when engaged in a venture of peculiar magnitude, but, as a rule, the assistance was unnecessary. Commercial transactions had not yet reached those prodigious proportions to which they have in the present century attained."

(2) Hasse, William F.. *A History of Money and Banking in Connecticut. New Haven (1957) Privately printed; Whaples-Bullis Co. Page 2.*

"Money in Connecticut, as in the other twelve original states, passed through various stages of growth. The earliest settlers had only a few coins and relied on the barter system for exchanging what they made or produced. As early Americans began to export farm products and such items as craftsmen could produce, foreign coins found their way into the early colonies. These foreign coins, added to the few English coins in America, began to eliminate the barter system: The state-issued

paper money, starting in 1709, was most unsatisfactory. Each of the states issued coins, including Connecticut's cents of 1785. There were also a few privately issued coins in the states. With coins of several foreign nations and an unstable paper money, trading was complicated!"

(3) **Clark, Victor S. *History of Manufactures in the United States, Volume I 1607-1860*. (1929 Edition, a reprint of the 1916 edition published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington in 1916). New York - Peter Smith - 1949. Page 9.**

ENGLAND'S MOTIVES FOR FOUNDING COLONIES

"The mercantile system governed the foreign-trade policy of Great Britain until the close of the eighteenth century. Its object was to produce at home what was consumed at home, and to increase exports but diminish imports, in order that the **stock of coin** [editor's emphasis] within the country might be preserved and enlarged.[1] The commercial motives for founding and maintaining colonies in America fell within the general lines of this policy."

[1] Cf. "Instructions for the Councill of Trade," Great Britain, *State Papers, Domestic*, Charles II, XXI, 27, quoted in Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry*, *Modern Times*, n, 914, § 7.

The "commodity monies" concepts as well as "bookkeeping barter" are very nicely illustrated in Ray Williamson's issue of CNL (Issue Number 72 - - January 1986) "Virginia's Early Money of Account".

As always, the comments of our Patrons are welcome. If any of you care to add to these discussions please write to us and we shall include your comments and observations in a future issue. New questions for **ASK the EDITORS** are, of course, especially encouraged. **JCS**

The Editorial Roundtable

Ye Editor suggested that each of our new Associate Editors present a few personal thoughts or ideas regarding the "state of the art" of early American numismatics, *The Colonial Newsletter* (CNL) itself, the current feelings of our Patrons, the future, or what ever seemed appropriate in today's world. Here are some of their thoughts:

From Phil Mossman

I was greatly flattered a few months ago when Jim Spilman suggested that I become an Associate Editor of *The Colonial Newsletter*. As I see it, my major qualification for such an honor is my insatiable curiosity about the currency of the pre-Federal era. Because of my compulsion to learn more about the numismatic and economic history of the period, I began in 1978 to review all available material on the subject. The results of my study were published in September 1986 as a monograph in the CNL as serial No. 74. Many CNL patrons shared their comments and assisted me to amend my initial effort such that an Addendum appeared in February 1988. This project by no means ended there. With the continued help of Jim Spilman and CNL patrons Raymond Williamson, Eric P. Newman, and Michael Hodder, the manuscript was largely rewritten and enlarged to over 300 pages. The work became more involved than could be handled through the resources of CNL and so the endeavor continued under the sponsorship of the American Numismatic Society (ANS). Thanks to Leslie A. Elam, Director, John M. Kleeberg, Associate Curator, and their experienced publishing staff, the book will be released later this year as Numismatic Studies #20. It proved to be more expensive than anticipated with

the retail price of the volume set at \$100, any profits benefiting the ANS. Financial assistance was appreciated from the Donald Groves Fund which enabled me to work on some publication details in New York. Thus I owe a debt of gratitude to many people who helped me develop my study of colonial numismatics into a finished volume to share with others.

I am very pleased with the format of the publication. In addition to many charts and tables, there are 74 plates, most of which picture multiple coins. For example, the entire Connecticut type-coin series is contained on a single plate. Most of the photos were made from specimens belonging to the American Numismatic Society whose colonial cabinet is very extensive. The Brasher doubloon is featured together with some very humble counterfeit English coppers. Period historical engravings, from the collections of the American Antiquarian Society and the New York Public Library, add a special contemporary level of interest. Selected examples of early paper currency were provided by Mr. Newman.

Now that this fifteen year project is coming to completion, it is quite appropriate for me to ask myself the following questions about colonial numismatics: what did I learn during all those hours of intensive study; what is our current state of knowledge; what does the future hold for continued research? I will attempt to comment briefly of these subjects since they do impact on the future role of *The Colonial Newsletter* as the major communication vehicle for the advancement of colonial numismatic research.

What did I learn: Obviously a great deal, but the greatest lesson was to realize that the coins which reside in our collections today were the money of yesterday, and as such must be appreciated in the context of the contemporary circulating currency. Why did one particular series of coins succeed as a satisfactory medium while

another failed? Such numismatic questions as this are easily clarified when the economic factors governing the circulation of money are understood.

What is the current state of the art:

Since none of the actual minting equipment of the period is known to have survived, the only available research materials are the actual coins themselves. Inferences and conclusions about the minting process can be drawn only from the examination of these specimens. Not only were these coins our former money, but the coiners and investors were real people whose lives can be studied by the paper trail they left. Present day research into genealogical and other legal records has given a human slant to this unfolding drama of numismatics. Unfortunately, there is much more that we don't know and should refrain from unsupported hypotheses until the facts are uncovered.

As for the future: Like all other sciences, numismatics is on the brink of an information explosion as newer technologies are applied, such as photographic analysis of die varieties and high-energy spectrographic determination of planchet composition. I'm sure that additional inquiry into contemporary records will reveal more clues concerning the complex interaction among the various coiners of the Confederation period. To my mind, one nagging question still remains to be answered. Many of our current concepts about the activity of various Confederation die sinkers and engravers rests on the examination of their letter punches as a means to link similar coinages to a common source. It has been proposed, but not proven, that such artisans made their own tools and so their personal sets of letter and number punches could become as individual as the engravers' handwritten signature. I have been intrigued by the possibility that a commercial source for punches existed during the post-Revolutionary period such that each engraver did not have to reinvent the wheel each time there was need

for punches. Since a sophisticated minting industry was flourishing in Birmingham by that time, is there evidence that engraving tools or matrices were commercially available? If every engraver had his private collection of matrices from which to raise his own punches, why are there so many missing and "blundered" legends in the Connecticut series? Why were not broken punches immediately replaced if the engraver had a common punch matrix at his disposal? I feel this question must be answered either in the affirmative or negative before we can evaluate the punch-link evidence upon which so much value has been placed since the time of Crosby.

One of the most valuable sources for material for my book was *The Colonial Newsletter*. Reflecting on the effort I've expended over the years on developing only 300+ pages, I have come to appreciate the enormous contribution Jim Spilman has made as editor of the CNL for the past 30 years. We all owe him a rousing "thank you" for a spectacular job well-done! He deserves our support and vote of confidence! **PLM**

From Gary Trudgen

Hello. I'm honored to have been chosen an Associate Editor of *The Colonial Newsletter* (CNL). Under the capable guidance and hard work of Jim Spilman CNL has flourished over the years. CNL not only promotes early American numismatics and related research, but also serves as a common tie for those of us who are enthralled by the coins from America's beginnings. Now it is time to give Jim some help with what I feel (and hopefully you agree) is a worthwhile endeavor.

CNL is highly regarded within the numismatic community for its scholarly studies. Personally, I would like to see CNL continue in this tone, but, at the same time, introduce some club-like topics to aid and encourage those who collect these charm-

ing pre-Federal coins that are commonly called "Colonials." Also, since it is only natural that we all do not have the same interests, it is important for CNL to cover a wide variety of research subjects. And what better way to do this than by encouraging the participation of each patron. So, let us hear from each of you with your questions, suggestions and articles as we enter into a new era with CNL. **GAT**

From Mike Hodder

I absolutely, unhesitatingly, and enthusiastically think you should raise the annual "dues". What your patrons currently get for their minimum contribution far outweighs what it costs them. However, I don't think you should raise the dues by a small amount, to the \$15 figure you wrote about. That's too small to start with, and if the "dues" have to be raised again in the near future (before 5 years) patrons will be doubly upset. Instead, raise the "dues" in one sharp step to, say, \$45 or \$50 per year. I can almost guarantee that virtually all your patrons will pay up, maybe with some mumbling, but where else can they get a journal devoted solely to colonial coins and medals? *Coin World* just raised its subscription rate to \$28 per year for 52 issues, but who saves and binds back copies of CW? ANA membership costs \$26 per year and the only tangible benefit is *The Numismatist*, which rarely publishes anything useful on colonials. I regularly pay \$50 for a book which may, or may not, have some single nugget of useful information. How many of your patrons already boost their "dues" payments by an additional contribution to the \$50 level? People expect to pay for what they get, and in the CNL they get the only journal dedicated to colonials.

I think that if you raised the "dues" substantially you would also have to give your readers something in return. Meaning, a journal that wasn't dedicated only to long research articles on specialized topics.

There are some fairly obvious options open here, I think. For example, the Colonial Coin Collectors' Club now numbers around 50 members who have written me wanting to join. There are many others who will simply show up at our first meeting at the next ANA convention. Each one of them has a story to tell about a favorite early coin or medal, a good buy, and so on. There's one article base not yet tapped. (Some of them have asked if the club could start its own newsletter, to contain just that sort of thing. I don't want to, as I've told you, but the interest is there and still untapped.) You could also publish the minutes (short, I promise) of meetings, club news, etc. Personally, I'd like to see a colonial coin auction sale review column in CNL, like there used to be in the old AJN. I could supply you with endless short takes on interesting and "common" coins any collector might be able to afford, as well as historical anecdotes about coins, famous pedigree notes, etc. I'm sure Gary could do similarly. But who wants to read Hodder and Trudgen every time they open a new CNL?

In other words, if you "lightened" the tone of CNL, made it more a "popular" journal, you'd be giving your patrons more of what I believe they want. You wouldn't have to cut out serious, specialized and technical articles. Just surround them with something else that **every** reader could relate to. Some of the people who read my "1787 Immunis Columbia" article have told me that they had to read it a couple of times to follow the argument and get my point. CNL shouldn't only be a journal that one has to get serious about when it arrives in the mail. Patrons should be excited when it arrives and be looking forward to a pleasant read, as well as a right brain challenge if they feel like one!

Right now I suspect that many patrons subscribe and pay their "dues" more out of a sense of obligation to support CNL and colonial coin research than any enjoyment they may receive from getting the journal.

Looking over the list of patrons, I can point to many who have told me they haven't read any of my long articles and to others who haven't read anything in CNL for years because there's nothing been published in their collecting areas of interest.

You might also think about including, dare I say it, advertising in the back pages. There are many dealer/patrons who would love to advertise in CNL, it's a ready-made market for them. Instead, they place ads in *Penny-Wise*. That's lost revenue to CNL. As far as I'm concerned, there's no loss of prestige or impartiality in taking advertising. Virtually every other coin publication does. So do *Scientific American*, *Science*, and other prestigious technical publications. The major auction houses would gladly buy full page ads for important sales of colonials.

If you boosted the annual "dues" and allowed advertising you'd maybe have the revenue you need to farm out some of the production effort, take it off your shoulders. You'd also have the resources to expand the size of CNL and maybe make it a bimonthly, too. **MJH**

Response from ye Editor

My thanks to Phil, Gary and Mike for their personal thoughts and suggestions. Some of these I take to heart, and some I do not; however, their observations certainly express the thinking of these three individuals as I know it, each of whom has his own personal situation to contend with, and each is to be commended for accepting an additional burden on his personal time to help with the editorial chores of CNL.

Mike's thoughts regarding a dues increase are, of course, reasonable from the point of view of an ever increasing size and scope for the CNL organization and publication, and someday may be required; however, for the present and in keeping with ye Editor's objective of maintaining a minimal cost non-profit operation readily accessible to all interested individuals, and

having a size and scope that can be readily handled by a few interested folk, we plan to continue offering the "basic" membership opportunity at a break-even cost level. There are several factors that can certainly increase this amount in the near future. One is the ongoing effort of the U.S. Postal Service to eliminate the non-profit mailing rate structure, and another is the continuing increase in printing costs, especially for halftone illustrations. You may notice that this present issue does not contain even one halftone.

"Personal time" is the operative phrase with CNL for our editors as well as our Patrons. Unless one is willing to take the time to participate by thinking, writing, questioning, conducting research, reporting their findings, etc. & etc. then CNL in the future cannot continue on a regular basis but would without doubt continue on a *very* irregular basis. Some would argue that our schedule today is already on an irregular basis and they would be correct! But if we do not have material for publication then an issue must wait until material is available.

On the other hand we usually have a backlog of major articles awaiting publication, and that is the case today. Sometimes these require a very large amount of that commodity "personal time" in order to make ready for publication. Sometimes two years or more has been necessary from the time a manuscript is received until it appears in the pages of CNL. Today we have in hand two papers that fall within this category - - one is the second part of Jeff Rock's Connecticut Update, and another is a wonderful paper by Sanborn Partridge on the Vermont Notes of 1781. Each of these papers have extensive illustrations and are exceedingly time consuming in their composition. But, we are working on them. Please be patient.

The use of personal computers for correspondence as well as page layout and composition has greatly simplified our task

in recent years. It has also produced a few new problems - - as an example, an inadvertent swipe of the computer mouse consolidated the two concluding paragraphs (page 1359) of Gary Trudgen's paper on his Nova Eborac FilmPrint Punch Study into a single garbled paragraph. The corrected two paragraphs are reprinted on page 1387 of this issue.

Our sincere thanks to each of you who have sent in your subscription renewals and financial contributions for the year 1993. We have yet to hear from about 20% of our Patrons and trust that we will soon receive your reply to our annual request. Thank you.

A quick note of some new discoveries that will be discussed in more detail in future issues:

- ① Mike Ringo reports a new Connecticut 33.29-s.1 of 1787 die variety combination.
- ② Mike Hodder reports a third specimen of New Jersey 14-J of 1788.
- ③ David Palmer reports a Fugio 14-O having upset reverse.
- ④ Dick Moore reports another Fugio 14-O with upset reverse plus a Fugio 104-FF in silver with an upset reverse.
- ⑤ Mike Peters and Arvid Johnson have each reported Libertas Americana medals in pewter, one having a unique inner "corded" border never previously seen before!

And one final note in remembrance of two recently deceased CNL Patrons

**Walter H. Breen
and
Dr. Warren A. Lapp**

each of whom, in his own way, made countless outstanding contributions to the science and art of early American numismatics. Their works speak eloquently for each of them.

JCS

A Late Date Analysis of the Fairfield Hoard

by Edward R. Barnsley

(G-9)

Originally published in the
NUMISMATIC DIGEST
Volume 1, Number 1,

September, 1962

The specific content of the famous Fairfield County, Connecticut, find of Early American coppers — the only one ever so discovered — must remain forever unknown. The coins alleged to have been unearthed there were dispersed before any of the numismatists involved had the acuity to make a complete record of what had apparently remained buried beneath a Stepney barn from 1788 to 1950. Only a fragment of the numismatic analysis remains; even the piece count is unknown, as well as the exact date of discovery and the names of the principals involved. The coins themselves are now scattered, and their particular identity lost by integration into various private collections. In some cases, the very coins themselves are gone, such as the absolutely unique example of 1786 Connecticut 4(2)-G.

Fortunately, however, Walter H. Breen was privileged to examine the greatest portion of this find a year or so following its discovery, and he subsequently published what he called a resume of it in his excellent compilation, "Survey of American Coin Hoards," printed in "The Numismatist," v. 65 (1952), p. 20. From this article we gather that some two hundred coppers comprising four different Early American series were uncovered, as per the following recapitulation:

NEW YORK, one specimen of Nova Eborac, type not given.

VERMONT, number of specimens uncertain, "reportedly including eight uncircu-

lated Vermont cents, head types"; and also two Ryder 13's and one Ryder 27. However, Breen said, concerning the three pieces last named, "I am not 100% certain these Vermonts were originally in the hoard, as their condition is far worse than that of the other 1788 issues. One of the Britannia Vermonts had an immense diebreak where the date should have been." This last sentence is extremely interesting, because the reverse of no known specimen of Ryder 13 shows either date or die break in the exergue. Was this piece, therefore, a new variety?

BRITISH TYPE HALFPENCE, seventy-two specimens, "all with correct legends, i.e. no bungtowns." Sixteen were dated 1778, 1787 and 1788, but the count on each date was not specified. Three of the 1787's had Ryder 13 reverses, and one of the 1787's was identical to the piece illustrated in John M. Richardson's "Copper Coins of Vermont," p. 4. Eric P. Newman wrote in 1958 that the said 72 pieces in this series consisted of both British and Irish halfpence, chiefly imitation and counterfeit. Consequently, a few of these pieces must have been official, regal issues. Newman's decisive article, "A Vermont Numismatic Enigma," was based upon a 1776 halfpenny which was likewise another one of the 72 unlisted specimens in this series.

CONNECTICUT, about 125 specimens. Breen stated that twenty-odd pieces in uncirculated condition had reportedly been sold before he examined the remainder. Note that these pieces were graded Uncirculated, along with eight similar Vermonts; the lot had been carefully cleaned of the encrustations accumulated after a century and three-quarters of earth entombment under an occupied barn. The remaining circulated pieces consisted then, Breen said, of eight 1785's, thirteen 1786's, seventy-five 1787's and four 1788's. However, the number of 1786's was printed incorrectly. There were according to his listing thirteen varieties in that year, consisting of eighteen specimens. Therefore,

the correct total of the Connecticut specimens thus examined was 105. The following table publishes for the first time a break-down of 104 of the some 125 Connecticut coppers which are believed to have been included in the so-called Fairfield hoard. Attributions are, of course, according to Miller's taxonomy. Rarity differentials are according to the 8-point scale established by Crosby and followed by Miller.

1785,

two 3(3)-F(3), R4
two 3(4)-F(2), R3
one 3(5)-B, R2
two 4(4)-C, R4
one 6(3)-G(1), R3

1786,

one 3-D(1), R4
two 4(1)-G, R2
one 4(2)-G, R6
one 5(2)-H(1), R5
one 5 (2)-I, R3
one 5(2)-L, R6
one 5(4)-O(1), R2
one 5(5)-M, R3
three 5(8)-F, R4
one 5(9)-B(1), R4
two 5(10)-L, R4
one 5 (11)-R, R5
two 5(14)-S; R6

1787,

three 2-B, R3
one 8-O, R3
one 9-D, R4
one 9-E, R4
one 9-R, R5
one 11(1)-E, R2
one 11(2)-K, R3
one 14-H, R3
one 20-a (2), R3
one 26-a(1), R5
one 31(1)-gg(1), R3
one 32(2)-r(3), RC
one 32(3)-X(4), RC
one 32(5)-aa, R3

one 33(1)-Z(13), R4
three 33(2)-Z(12), RC
one 33(2)-Z(17), R4
one 33(6)-KK, R1
one 33(7)-r(4), R6
one 33(9)-s(2), R2
one 33(10)-Z(7), R5
one 33(10)-Z(8), R4
one 33(12)-Z(16), R3
one 33(12)-Z(24), R6
one 33(13)-Z(1), R5
one 33(13)-Z(7), R4
one 33(14)-Z(14), R3
two 33(15)-r(1), R1
one 33(16)-Z(15), R1
one 33(17)-r(1), R3
one 33(17)-gg(2), R2
two 33(19)-Z(1), RC
one 33(28)-Z(11), R3
four 33(28)-Z(16), R3.
three 33(32)-Z(13), R1
one 33(36)-T(2), R1
one 33(40)-Z(2), R5
one 37(1)-cc(1), R2
one 37(2)-k(5), R3
three 37(3)-i, R2
two 31(4)-k(1), R1
one 37 (8)-HH, R3
two 37(8)-LL, R3
two 37(9)-e, R3
two 37(11)-ff(2), R3
one 37(12)-LL, R4
one 38-l(2), R3
two 38-GG, R2
one 41-ii, R3
one 44-W(4), R2
one 44-W(5), R5
one 46-BB, R4
three 53-FF, R4
one identity lost

1788,

one 9-E, R4
two 12(1)-F(1), R3
one 12(2)-E, R3

TN-131 Revisited, or Mea Culpa
from Phil Mossman; CNL Associate Editor

(TN-131A)

In March 1990, CNL pp. 1144-49, I shared with the Patrons some further thoughts on the weights of Connecticut coppers engraved by Abel Buell. These ideas were expanded and subsequently became the focus of my presentation to the Seventh Coinage of the Americas Conference sponsored by The American Numismatic Society on May 4, 1991.

Starting on page 1147, I described "The Most Common Confederation Copper" as determined from my Table XI, CNL Serial #74, pp. 134-5, which now has been expanded to 4,300 specimens. Those coppers enumerated in this census are from auctions and institutional and private collection for which weights have been listed. In many of these auctions, there was a heavy representation of New Jersey coppers and so the frequency rate for these Confederation coppers may be subject to significant sampling errors.

In my original CNL communication (p. 1148), I erroneously omitted the Connecticut Draped Bust Left varieties. The oversight occurred since I was considering the entire group of 1787 Draped Bust Left coppers as the most common "type" of state copper, and, therefore, failed to examine the frequency of the individual varieties. While as a composite "type" group, the Draped Bust Left coppers are by far the most numerous, what are the most commonly encountered die varieties within this style? This present TN-131 Revisited hopes to correct this omission.

After realizing this oversight, I reviewed my data and reformulated the results. The New Jersey "camel head" Maris-56 still leads the pack way out in front. Following that, I thought it more accurate to arrange the coppers in groups of five for those varieties with fifteen or more specimens in my census. This new tabulation contains four 1787 and one 1788 Connecticut Draped Bust Left varieties, which in their own right are very common as individuals.

No Massachusetts coppers appear on this list but the closest ones for this distinction are the 1788 half cent, Ryder 1-B, with 14 specimens, and the 1787 "horned eagle" cent, Ryder 2b-A with 12. Reference is made to the article by Packard:CNL 1989, pp. 1100-7, which addresses this issue. All Vermont coppers are decidedly less frequently seen in auctions but the presence of the Nova Eborac in this census came as a surprise.

The coins on this census are rarity 1, except where indicated. The frequent occurrence of New Jersey 17-b and 54-k, and Connecticut 1.2-C, 13-D, and 14-H suggests that the rarity estimated for these issues is exaggerated and needs reappraisal.

The revised chart is shown on the next page.

Most Common Confederation Coppers
(Revised)

Incidence Within Sample Of 4,300 Coppers	Confederation Copper
55	New Jersey: 56-n, "camel head."
35-39	Connecticut: 4-L, "horned bust."
30-34	Connecticut: (1787) 33.7-r2*.
25-29	New Jersey: 64-t; 46-e; 48-g; 17-b (R-4).
20-24	New Jersey: 67-v; 43-d; 14-J; 18-M; 63-S. Connecticut: (1788) 2-D+.
15-19	Connecticut: (1787) 31.1-r4*; 6.1-M, "laughing head"; 33.15-r1 (R-2)*; 13-D, (R-4) "childish head"; 1.2-C (R-3) "muttonhead"; 33.2-Z5*; 14-H (R-4). (1788) 16.3-N (R-2)*. New Jersey: 54-k (R-3); 77-dd (R-2); 21-N; 6-D. Nova Eborac: figure left.

* = Draped Bust Left variety
+ = Mailed Bust Right variety

While the 1787 Connecticut 4-L maintains its number two position in this "corrected" census, the thrd most common copper is now the 1787 Draped Bust Left 33.7-r2. Three other 1787 Draped Bust Left coppers are now added to the rolls in the last quintet of 15-19 specimens. It is to be stressed that this census of the most common Confederation coppers is very sensitive to sampling errors; these positions are not absolute, but represent only a trend. The only exception to this may be 56-n, which is so far in front of all others. At the lower end of the scale there is a great clustering of coppers in the 15-19 quintet; there are many other coppers which could have made the chart for the sake of one or two more specimens in the census.



TN-151 Revisited & Corrected from ye Editor

(TN-151A)

The unfortunate computer goof by ye Editor, mentioned on page 1382 of this issue, combined two paragraphs into one and scrambled both on the final page of Gary Trudgen's paper on his Nova Eborac FilmPrint Punch Study. Please substitute the following two paragraphs for the final paragraph printed on page 1359 of the previous issue (CNL No. 93). **JCS**

This study confirms that all four Nova Eborac varieties are indeed interlocked via the same numeral and letter punches. This condition strongly argues that all of the Nova Eborac dies were prepared by the same engraver (probably John Bailey) and that the coppers were struck by the same group of coiners. Therefore, the "small head" variety is not a contemporary counterfeit. Importantly, this study also provides additional evidence that the Connecticut "Muttonhead" coppers of 1787 were also struck by this same coinage operation.

The author has the utmost confidence in the accuracy of the preceding study. It should be noted, however, that punch comparison study is not an exact science. Several factors must be taken into consideration when comparing the same punched characters (either letter, numeral, or ornamental device). The overall widths and heights of two characters that were punched into separate dies with the same punch will be nearly the same. But, the outline of the character on the coins struck from these dies can vary, sometimes significantly. The differences that can arise start with the die preparation. When the character was punched into the dies, the engraver may have punched one character deeper into one die than the other. Since the sides of the punch were tapered, it results in a difference in the width of the strokes that make-up the character. Furthermore, the engraver may have punched one character into the die at a different angle than the other. When a character is not punched perpendicularly into a die, the width of the character strokes can vary (either increase or decrease) along their length. Also, the engraver may have touched up the character by hand on one die and not the other. Another important factor is that collars were not used with the dies. Thus, striking pressure and the softness of the copper blank determines the amount of radial expansion during striking and how well the metal flowed into the character on the die. Die and coin wear will also change the appearance of the character. Therefore, the early American coinage researcher must expect to see variations (usually minor) between characters on coppers that were struck from dies prepared with the same punches. And he must be able to recognize when this difference is a result of the many preceding factors or is indeed due to a different punch.